

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful review of this application. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, patently distinguish the claims over cited arts of record.

Claim 1 is amended and claims 5, 6 are canceled. Moreover, claims 7 and 8 are new. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 7-8 remain pending.

The changes made to the claims overcome the rejections noted by the Examiner. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Present Status of Application

The Office Action rejected all claims 1-6. Specifically, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration of all rejected claims.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

Arrangement of the Specification

The arrangement of the specification should include the sections provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b). Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. The application does not contain an

abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). The title of the invention is not descriptive, either.

The title and the specification are amended on the attachment so that the title is descriptive and the specification has the section headings as provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b). Furthermore, the abstract is also added on a separate sheet. Therefore, the rejections to the title, specification and abstract are traversed.

Objection of drawings

The drawings are objected to because every circuit blocks from figure 3 must be proper labeled, for example, block 3 is “drive unit”, block 4 is “decoder IC”, block 5 is “DSP”, etc.,.

Applicants have amended the figure 3 so that every circuit block in figure 3 is properly labeled and the objection of figure 3 is traversed.

Rejection of claims 1-6 based on 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subjected matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have amended the claim 1 so that the unclear and indefinite limitations are corrected. The amended claim 1 recites:

1. A module for reading data from a data carrier, the module comprising: a processor arrangement and a memory arrangement,

wherein the data carrier comprises data sequences and information on the data sequences, and the data sequences are stored in a directory structure with a

root directory and at least one subdirectory,

when reading data from the data carrier, the processor arrangement writes the information about a first subset of the data sequences present in the root directory into a first directory of the memory arrangement, and writes the information about at least a second subset of the data sequences present in a subdirectory of the data carrier into a second directory of the memory arrangement.

As disclosed in the paragraph [0014] of the specification: "The advantage of such a module is that the items of information on the data sequences present in the root directory of a data carrier are all stored in a directory of the memory arrangement. The access to this directory enhances the clarity for the user as regards the nature of the data sequences he/she accesses. On the data carrier itself, these data sequences may be mixed in any manner desired with data sequence structures (for example ROM data sequence structures). It is a further advantage that the information on each data sequence that is laid down in a respective subdirectory can also be found in one respective directory in the memory arrangement." Accordingly, by writing the information on the data sequences present in the root directory and subdirectory into different directory of the memory arrangement, the access to this directory enhances the clarity for the user as regards the nature of the data sequences he/she accesses.

Hence, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 and 7-8 are traversed.

Moreover, claim 6 is canceled so that the objection to the claim 6 is traversed.

Conclusion

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit the claims 1-4 and 7-8 to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. In view of foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims and drawings are in proper condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
WPAT, P.C.
By _____/Justin I. King/ _____
Justin I. King
Registration No. 50,464

April 12, 2010
WPAT, P.C.
1940 Duke Street
Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 684-4411
Facsimile (703) 880-7487